DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 223 119 HE 015 202

AUTHOR Stier, William F., Jr.
TITLE Faculty Evaluation: A Positive Approach.
PUB DATE 26 Apr 82
NOTE 34p.; Paper presented at the Annual Meeting of the American Alliance for Health, Physical Education, Recreation and Dance (Houston, TX, April 22-26, 1982).
PUB TYPE Speeches/Conference Papers (150) -- Tests/Evaluation Instruments (160)

EDRS PRICE MF01/PC02 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS Evaluation Criteria; *Faculty Evaluation; Feedback; Higher Education; *Instructional Improvement; *Peer Evaluation; Personnel Policy; Questionnaires; *Self Evaluation (Individuals); *Student Evaluation of Teacher Performance; *Teacher Effectiveness

ABSTRACT

The objectives and techniques of faculty evaluation are examined. It is suggested that the reasons for the evaluation process play a significant role in how such evaluations are perceived by all involved and how successful the process will be in reaching the objectives of the evaluation process. Four specific competencies that can be evaluated are: technical skills, interpersonal relationship skills, conceptual skills, and dedication. Generally, there are four commonly used systems or styles of evaluation in use today with education: self-evaluation/self-assessment, administrative evaluation/assessment, peer evaluation, and student evaluation. Study findings have revealed that the most common system of evaluation involves only student and administrative evaluation. When evaluation information is used as feedback to aid in staff self-development, research suggests that teachers, staff, and administrators favor such evaluation. However, if this information is used exclusively for administrative decisions such as rehiring, dismissal, salary increments, and tenure, teachers do not support evaluation. The Peer and Self-Evaluation Checklist, which is appended, may be used for self-evaluation, administrative evaluation, and peer evaluation, and covers six competency areas. Criticisms of self-evaluation and about evaluation in general are identified. Appended materials include evaluation forms used by Ohio Northern University; an instructional or coinstructional assessment sheet that delineates the quantitative tasks that absorb an individual's time and effort; student evaluation form for physical education activity class; form for student evaluation of course instruction; and faculty evaluation form. (SW)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

ED223119

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY

William F. Stuit

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)."

FACULTY EVALUATION -- A POSITIVE APPROACH

There seems to be an ever increasing outcry for accountability within our educational systems today. The various publics are demanding that those of us involved in education -- whether as teachers or as administrators -- become more accountable, that we be evaluated and judged on our performance, our skills and our competencies.

Thus, the subject of evaluation has become a rather controversial issue due to the current state of affairs in our schools -- at all levels -- what with declining enrollments, tightening budgets, teacher layoffs, hiring freezes, need for more accountability, falling tests scores and the desire by various segments of society, special interest groups and selected school people, to eliminate the so-called DEADWOOD.

In any discussion of evaluation one should examine seven specific areas or questions:

1. WHY should evaluation even be attempted?
2. WHAT should be evaluated?
3. HOW will the evaluation be accomplished?
4. WHO should be involved in the evaluation process?
5. For what PURPOSE will the evaluation results be used?
6. WHEN and WHERE will the evaluation process take place?
7. What will be the PLANS and PROCEDURES following the evaluation?
8. Through what means will the evaluation process be ENCOURAGED?

Lets face it, evaluation is not an easy thing to do. If it was everyone would be doing it in an easy fashion and there would be a great deal less controversy, hesitation, fear or mystic surrounding the process of evaluation.

The ultimate objective of evaluation is to achieve better performance - qualitative and quantitative performance. This necessitates a CONTINUOUS EVALUATION PROCESS or SYSTEM and this process or system should involve many different individuals and groups of individuals working

HE015202

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)

together for a common purpose, an agreed upon goal or objective.

A system of staff evaluation is based upon objective facts and data but also includes -- by necessity -- subjective judgment. Just because something cannot be measured in cold, hard data doesn't mean that it is not a significant or integral facet of the evaluation process.

The process of evaluation should include an examination of all relevant school happenings which may affect a person's performance. The key to evaluation is one's performance, one's competencies, one's realization of previously established and agreed upon objectives and goals within the framework of one's responsibilities (as outlined in a person's job description).

How does one define competency? It is essential to have agreement as to the specific tasks to be performed and quality of the performance by the individual being evaluated. Stripped of educational jargon or technical language, a competency is simply an ability to do something, a skill. However, one's evaluation might include not only an examination of one's competencies, one's skills but also one's personality or personal traits. To be assessed in an evaluation of a teacher or administrator could be such factors as tangible skills and competencies as well as intangible qualities such as attitudes, feelings, vague contributions and personality.

Just exactly what are the characteristics of good, effective teachers, staff members and administrators? What competencies and skills do effective teachers, staff personnel and administrators possess and demonstrate? What effect do these individuals have on student achievements? What effect do these individuals have on the schools and the total educational systems? The answers to these

questions will help in deciding WHAT to evaluate.

Why evaluate? Simply because we need to know if we are successful in what we do and to what extent we are or are not meeting our goals and objectives. Also, to demonstrate accountability and to justify the allocation of resources within an educational setting. Finally, we evaluate to change or modify behavior or to reinforce behavior or to improve performance -- qualitatively and/or quantitatively. It is through the evaluation process that we are able to get information, to find out status, to plan for the future and to make decisions.

Lets face it, the reason(s) behind the evaluation process within any evaluation system plays a significant role in how such evaluations are perceived by all involved and how successful the process will be in reaching the objectives of the evaluation process.

What should be evaluated? Should teaching, research, service, other duties be evaluated? Are such activities capable of being evaluated? Should we evaluate only that which have been formally assigned and which affects the tasks assigned?

Generally, teachers, staff personnel and administrators want to be, deserve to be AND ARE GOING TO INDEED BE OBSERVED AND EVALUATED every day of their professional experience. It is up to us, those involved in the educational systems throughout the country, to see that the evaluation process is a meaningful learning experience. A planned (formal or informal) process should have positive consequences for the individual(s) being evaluated, the evaluators and the students whom we all serve.

Generally, we consider that there are four specific skills or competency which might be evaluated. These are:

1. Technical skills
2. Interpersonal relationship skills
3. Conceptual skills (being able to see the big picture)
4. Dedication skills

How should performance, competencies, skills be evaluated. Objective and subjective type judgments are both defensible and necessary in the evaluation process. Formal and informal tactics may and are utilized in the system or process. Various instruments may be used as "tools" within the evaluation process.

Who may be involved in any evaluation situation? The quality of performance may be measured in terms of opinion, values and perceptions held by administrators, one's self, one's peers, students, alumni and others who have had opportunities to actually observe first hand or who have been the beneficiaries of someone's skills and performance.

Generally, there are four commonly utilized systems or styles of evaluation in use today in educational circles. These include:

1. Self evaluation/self-assessment
2. Administrative evaluation/assessment
3. Peer evaluation
4. Student evaluation

In a national research investigation of small colleges and universities (with an undergraduate enrollment below 2501) various systems or methods of faculty evaluation were studied. Of the four types of evaluation tactics commonly utilized -- self evaluation, administrative evaluation, peer evaluation and student evaluation -- the study revealed that the most common system of evaluation involved only student and administrative evaluation. The second most prevalent system of evaluation of teachers included all four activities (self, administrative, peer and student). The third most popular system involved only self, student and administrative evaluation techniques.

It is interesting to note that in this study, administrative evaluation techniques were evident in 86% of the institutions studied while student evaluation was utilized in 84% of the schools. In third place came self evaluation (44%) while peer evaluation was used only in 36% of the colleges and universities. (Appendix A)

Self evaluation or self analysis, when utilized in a vaccum -- by itself -- holds at best a very limited promise to improve behavior which, as stated earlier, is one of the overall objectives of evaluation. The same can be said -- although not to the degree perhaps -- of each of the four commonly utilized evaluation techniques. Evaluation really is a process, a system which is to involve more than a single entity or method of assessment.

The problem with the evaluation process traditionally revolves around HOW it is done -- not if it is to be accomplished. The fact that evaluation must be accomplished through a human process, with human beings, only complicates matters since, being human, we must perform value judgments, make decisions based upon one's perceptions and prior experiences. However, it is essential that we do interpret, we attempt to confirm and validate the data collected in the best and fairest fashion possible in any given situation.

EVALUATION -- THE POSITIVE APPROACH -- is just that, an approach, a continuous process, a method, an attitude towards evaluation which reveals that the process is to be utilized in a most POSITIVE vein, for the express purpose of assisting others and ourselves to reach our agreed upon objectives and to obtain a higher level of performance with greater sophistication, skill and competency.

Any evaluation process or system must not be merely judgmental in nature nor should the process induce anxiety and fear in those being

evaluated. There is a need to have an upbeat flavor in evaluation activities. Evaluation needs to be constructive in nature and not distructive or threatening or devious or divisive.

It is often the PROCESS itself -- whether it be self evaluation, administrative evaluation, peer evaluation or student evaluation -- which is important as it is the PROCESS which makes one more aware, more cognizant and forces one to think in terms of one's own competency, one's level of performance and which increases one's consciousness of how one might increase one's effectiveness and efficiency.

The purpose for which the results of any evaluation process are obtained shall have a significant effect upon the effectivenss of the process itself. When information is used as feedback to aid in the teacher's (or staff personnel or administrator's) self-development, research suggests that teachers, staff and administrators favor such evaluation. This is especially true in instances where self evaluation and administrative evaluation techniques are employed.

Similar support of the evaluation is evident if the individuals who are to be evaluated have had a say in the evaluation process, the development of the tactics to be used in the evaluation and if they agree to the purposes for which the results will be used.

However, if this information is used exclusively for such administrative decisions as listed below, teachers do not support evaluation.

1. Rehiring
2. Dismissal
3. Assignments
4. Salary increments
5. Tenure
6. Promotion
7. Merit pay

Basically, it is a question of the attitude towards evaluation - FEAR versus OPENNESS. Thus, it is essential that one strives towards

positive relationships and attitudes in establishing and carrying out any evaluation plan or system. There is a need, on the one hand, for administrators to have accountability while, on the other hand, there is a true need for reassurance, safety, freedom from anxiety and mistrust on behalf of those individuals being evaluated, being judged.

Recognizing that teachers are different, with each possessing different strengths, weaknesses, styles and competencies as well as desires, perceptions and impressions, it is essential for these individuals to be able to work together for the benefit of the students as well as their own professional growth, development and advancement. This realization of the importance and function of the evaluation process as a growth, improvement process, is an important part, almost an essential feature of any POSITIVE APPROACH TO EVALUATION.

An instrument, such as the Peer and Self-Evaluation Checklist (PSEC), may be most helpful in collecting objective and subjective information about an individual involved in both teaching and administrative tasks (Appendix B). This instrument, which may be utilized for self evaluation, administrative evaluation and peer evaluation, attempts to solicit information and perceptions about a person's ability and traits in six specific areas. These areas of competency include:

1. Goal-Priority orientation (5 items)
2. Open-mindedness (8 items)
3. Willingness to work (4 items)
4. Human relations (17 items)
5. Personal characteristics (7 items)
6. Professional skills and competencies (19 items)

The strategy involved in the implementation of any evaluation system or method is all important. In order to instill trust and a willingness to accept the evaluation process it is necessary to have those who would implement such evaluation techniques for others to utilize these same methods and systems themselves. It should be a case of "do as I do" and

not "do as I say and not as I do". We must lead by example, especially in terms of faculty evaluation. Evaluation should not be imposed from outside upon teachers or staff or other personnel. A chairperson or dean must work with teachers to solicit cooperation, assistance and support of the need for such evaluation and the actual tactics and techniques used in the process and the use for which the results shall be put. To do otherwise can result in consequences which can be so undesirable as to almost completely contaminate the evaluation process or system itself and, therefore, bias the results.

It is essential that one tread softly and move with great care through the process in which there has historically been concern (and with some justification) for honesty and trust. It is as if one must seemingly walk through a minefield in which it takes more than a single person (administrator) to hold the mine detector. People become fearful and threatened, with adversary type relationships developing as a result, if they are exposed to unfamiliar activities and/or expectations or if they have hesitations or second feelings regarding how an experience will work out or are unclear as to how results will be utilized or manipulated.

To foster a feeling of cooperation, of support, of mutual concern and respect is the challenge at hand. There should be an agreement as to the process of evaluation, the techniques and tactics utilized and how the results are to be treated. Finally, the ultimate goal of evaluation, the benefit of the students and the growth and development of the individuals being evaluated, must be recognized.

The specific purposes of evaluation might be classified under the following:

1. Change of teacher behavior
2. Improvement of instruction or other skills
3. Improvement of specific aspects of a teacher's performance
4. Initiation of experimentation; attempt to get teachers to try new things, new ideas
5. Promotion of an attitude of "we can do it better"

The realization of these goals can be greatly facilitated if both teachers and administrators feel that the goals and purposes are worthwhile.

Some concerns with self evaluation have been expressed within the professional literature and are summarized below.

1. Research literature on self evaluation is rather skimpy and, for the most part, inconclusive. But most studies reveal a significant gulf between student and peer evaluation and the teacher's own self evaluation.

2. Self evaluation has been critized due to an overriding mistrust of its accuracy and seemingly unreliability as a meaningful yardstick of competency or performance.

3. Some faculty have voiced concern that self evaluation or assessment is inherently faulty in that individuals look upon themselves as proficient. Therefore, a honest self assessment is somewhat rare according to these individuals.

4. There is an ever present danger than an incompetent person conducting a self-appraisal cannot usually appreciate the fact that he/she is performing at a level which is unsatisfactory or from a somewhat limited level of competency. In these cases it may become not an evaluation of one's self but rather an opportunity to justify whatever that individual does.

5. Self evaluation, although effective for new and inexperienced teachers, may be the most significant part of a teacher evaluation plan or

system for the experienced, tenured teachers.

6. Some research has found that superior teachers (judged via other methods) are more accurate in the self assessment experiences than the so-called mediocre teachers.

Listed below are three dangers commonly expressed about evaluation attempts regardless of what specific tactics are employed.

1. There are always dangers inherent in any evaluation process in that in any faculty group, once the faculty members have been rated, half of the faculty are below the average (of that group) while the other half are above the average -- regardless of how capable they may be.

2. Some evaluation experiences can poison faculty and student as well as faculty and administrative, faculty and peer relationships by encouraging individuals to USE students, administrators and peers rather than to educate and/or professionally interact with them.

3. Some methods, techniques and instruments, when used improperly, can inhibit academic free expression, encourage faculty to target instruction and actions to the lowest common denominator and cause the faculty to withhold or distort their professional judgment.

There is no one best evaluation plan. Deficiences are often due to limitations in time, personnel, evaluation instruments, money, effort, other resources as well as a lack of a broad base support on behalf of all involved in the projected evaluation process. Since there is no one best evaluation plan, it is possible to implement a variety of evaluation systems depending upon the particular circumstances and assets and objectives of any given situation. A multi-faceted approach to evaluation of teachers seems to be the trend in colleges and universities.

At Ohio Northern University, it is this multi-faceted approach which comprises faculty assessment. In addition to self evaluation,

student evaluation and administrative evaluation, selected departments within the College of Arts and Sciences also employ peer evaluation. Several specific instruments are used in conjunction with the evaluation. system. The first of these is a so-called "brag" sheet which attempts to be very specific (quantitatively and qualitatively) in detailing the accomplishments and achievements of an individual professor. The second device, utilized university wide, is an "instructional"/ "co-instructional" assessment sheet which attempts to delinenate the quantitative type tasks which absorb an individual's time and effort in the performance of one's responsibility. (Appendix C).

Instruments utilized for student evaluation take many forms. Some instruments are used for specific types of classes (activity versus non-activity classes) while other forms are utilized college wide in contrast to student evaluation forms which are used exclusively by one department to take into consideration that department's unique educational experiences (Appendix D, E, F).

In conclusion, it must be emphasized that to help insure success in the implementation and utilization of any evaluation system there must be evident, visible support for such activity from the administration of the institution in the form of funds expended as well as time made available for the planning, implementation and follow-up of the evaluation system. The term "follow-up" is most important for what good does it do for an institution or department to establish an evaluation system or process if there is no follow-up subsequent to the actual evaluation activity insofar as helping those involved in the evaluation process to grow and develop professionally and personally. THE ULTIMATE QUESTION IS NOT WHETHER OR NOT THERE WILL BE EVALUATION -- BUT IN WHAT MANNER AND FASHION WILL SUCH EVALUATION TAKE AND WHAT IS TO BE DONE AS A RESULT?

APPENDIX A

EVALUATION TECHNIQUES UTILIZED WITHIN HPER & D DEPARTMENTS

# of Depts.	%	Self-E	Stu.-E	Admin.-E	Peer-E	
1	.75	YES	YES		YES	
25	18.94	YES	YES	YES	YES	SECOND
5	3.79	YES	YES			
35	26.52		YES	YES		FIRST
23	17.42	YES	YES	YES		THIRD
11	8.33		YES	YES	YES	
11	8.33			YES		
7	5.30		YES			
2	1.52	YES		YES		
4	3.03	YES		YES	YES	
2	1.52			YES	YES	
4	3.03		YES		YES	
2	1.52	YES				
132	100%	60 (44%)	111 (84%)	113 (86%)	47 (36%)	

(Colleges and Universities with an enrollment below 2501)

Appendix: B

Educators have traditionally given lip service to the process of evaluation, both peer evaluation and self-evaluation. In recent years there has been a concerted effort across a broad spectrum of educational levels to develop more sophisticated methods and "tools" which may be utilized in determining the effectiveness and efficiency of an individual or groups of individuals in the performance of specific or general duties and responsibilities. Undoubtedly the renewed interest in educational evaluation processes and techniques is a direct result of the increased significance currently being given in educational circles to the term "accountability".

A direct outgrowth of the increasing concern toward accountability in education is the PEER AND SELF-EVALUATION CHECKLIST (PSEC) which was first developed in 1972. The PSEC was developed and refined in order to provide greater insight into an individual's competency. The checklist contains sixty (60) items or criteria which are distributed within the following six general areas of competency:

(A) Goal-Priority Orientation - - 5 items

(B) Open-mindedness - - 8 items

(C) Willingness To Work - - 4 items

(D) Human Relations - - 17 items

(E) Personal Characteristics - - 7 items

(F) Professional Skills and Competency - - 19 items

For each of the sixty items comprising the instrument there is a choice of six possible responses (with accompanying point values) which may be checked.

The responses include:

(A) N/A - - no point value

(B) Totally Unacceptable - - 1 point

(C) Poor - - 3 points

(D) Average - - 5 points

(E) Above Average - - 7 points

(F) Superior - - 9 points

It should be noted that for each item which N/A is checked as the response, nine points should be subtracted from the total number of points which may possibly be earned. For example, if there are three such items which are checked N/A then 27 (3 x 9 pts.) should be subtracted from the total 540 possible points (60 x 9 pts.) leaving 513 possible points which may be earned by a specific individual. The total point value revealed through the administration of the PSEC merely provides a frame of reference within which a specific person's competency may be viewed in light of the total possible points.

The PSEC may be utilized to subjectively evaluate others (in light of the arbitrarily established criteria) as well as for self-evaluative purposes. In instances where an individual (administrator for example) wishes to utilize the PSEC to evaluate a second person it is recommended that the person being evaluated be encouraged to complete the instrument himself followed by an examination, comparison and frank discussion of the results which are obtained by both the person being evaluated and the individual initiating the evaluation process.

In the situation where an individual desires to initiate a self-evaluation he may merely complete the instrument himself or may elect to secure the assistance of working associates who should be asked to complete the instrument in an anonymous manner.

In attempting to complete a self-evaluation via the PSEC it is possible and often advisable for the person instigating the self-evaluation to compare his concept of his own competencies with the anonymous responses of those associates who have agreed to also complete the instrument. In examining the responses to the various items within the instrument it is possible to obtain an overview of the general competencies of an individual by viewing all sixty items as a whole. In addition, one may view each of the six general categories comprising the PSEC as an entity in itself. Reviewing each category separately provides greater insight into the six arbitrarily created dimensions of professional competency as provided in the PSEC.

A score sheet is included in the Appendix which provides for tabulation, in numerical order, of all sixty items within the instrument. In addition, the score sheet enables items within each of the six general categories of competency to be tabulated as portions of a sub-group.

PEER AND SELF EVALUATION CHECKLIST

INSTRUCTIONS: Please circle the appropriate response for each item as it relates to the individual in question. If you have had no opportunity to observe the individual in respect to a specific item, please so indicate by circling N/A.

---

(1) Ability to recognize the need for creating priorities and following same.

N/A TOTALLY UNACCEPTABLE POOR AVERAGE ABOVE AVERAGE SUPERIOR

(2) Ability to accept "points of view" of others.

N/A TOTALLY UNACCEPTABLE POOR AVERAGE ABOVE AVERAGE SUPERIOR

(3) Integrity in his personal and professional relationship with others.

N/A TOTALLY UNACCEPTABLE POOR AVERAGE ABOVE AVERAGE SUPERIOR

(4) Ability to "laugh at oneself".

N/A TOTALLY UNACCEPTABLE POOR AVERAGE ABOVE AVERAGE SUPERIOR

(5) Willingness to go beyond what is expected of him in respect to his responsibilities at the institution.

N/A TOTALLY UNACCEPTABLE POOR AVERAGE ABOVE AVERAGE SUPERIOR

(6) Ability to accept others for what they are and to work with them in the most productive manner in respect to effectiveness and efficiency.

N/A TOTALLY UNACCEPTABLE POOR AVERAGE ABOVE AVERAGE SUPERIOR

(7) Ability to get along with administrators and others in higher authority.

N/A TOTALLY UNACCEPTABLE POOR AVERAGE ABOVE AVERAGE SUPERIOR

(8) Has he demonstrated initiative or the ability to take action?

N/A TOTALLY UNACCEPTABLE POOR AVERAGE ABOVE AVERAGE SUPERIOR

(9) Ability to plan, organize, and evaluate an efficient organization.

N/A TOTALLY UNACCEPTABLE POOR AVERAGE ABOVE AVERAGE SUPERIOR

(10) Ability to accept praise in a professional manner.

N/A TOTALLY UNACCEPTABLE POOR AVERAGE ABOVE AVERAGE SUPERIOR

(11) Willingness and ability to "listen" to others.

N/A TOTALLY UNACCEPTABLE POOR AVERAGE ABOVE AVERAGE SUPERIOR

(12) Has the individual demonstrated that he is a dedicated professional?

N/A TOTALLY UNACCEPTABLE POOR AVERAGE ABOVE AVERAGE SUPERIOR

(13) Does the individual have a sense of humor?

N/A TOTALLY UNACCEPTABLE POOR AVERAGE ABOVE AVERAGE SUPERIOR

(14) Ability to get along well with others.

N/A TOTALLY UNACCEPTABLE POOR AVERAGE ABOVE AVERAGE SUPERIOR

(15) Ability and willingness to work effectively and efficiently in one-on-one situations.

N/A TOTALLY UNACCEPTABLE POOR AVERAGE ABOVE AVERAGE SUPERIOR

(16) Can the individual think for himself?

N/A TOTALLY UNACCEPTABLE POOR AVERAGE ABOVE AVERAGE SUPERIOR

(17) Ability to evaluate the competencies and areas of expertise of others.

N/A TOTALLY UNACCEPTABLE POOR AVERAGE ABOVE AVERAGE SUPERIOR

(18) Willingness to accept responsibility and authority for discharging obligations to the institution and the profession.

N/A TOTALLY UNACCEPTABLE POOR AVERAGE ABOVE AVERAGE SUPERIOR

(19) Ability to see beyond the "trees" and to view the entire "forest" in its proper perspective.

N/A TOTALLY UNACCEPTABLE POOR AVERAGE ABOVE AVERAGE SUPERIOR

(20) Ability to take direction.

N/A TOTALLY UNACCEPTABLE POOR AVERAGE ABOVE AVERAGE SUPERIOR

(21) Is the individual intelligent and well-rounded in educational philosophy?

N/A TOTALLY UNACCEPTABLE POOR AVERAGE ABOVE AVERAGE SUPERIOR

(22) Ability to relate well with students.

N/A TOTALLY UNACCEPTABLE POOR AVERAGE ABOVE AVERAGE SUPERIOR

(23) Willingness to spend more than "his fare share" of time and effort in activities involving the institution.

N/A TOTALLY UNACCEPTABLE POOR AVERAGE ABOVE AVERAGE SUPERIOR

(24) Willingness to cooperate in a responsible and meaningful manner - - not always "having to have one's own way".

N/A TOTALLY UNACCEPTABLE POOR AVERAGE ABOVE AVERAGE SUPERIOR

(25) Awareness of group processes in the working interrelationships of the institution.

N/A TOTALLY UNACCEPTABLE POOR AVERAGE ABOVE AVERAGE SUPERIOR

(26) Is the individual creative in the performance of his responsibilities?

N/A TOTALLY UNACCEPTABLE POOR AVERAGE ABOVE AVERAGE SUPERIOR

(27) Ability to make decisions.

N/A TOTALLY UNACCEPTABLE POOR AVERAGE ABOVE AVERAGE SUPERIOR

(28) General level of professional TECHNICAL COMPETENCE in his areas of responsibility.

N/A TOTALLY UNACCEPTABLE POOR AVERAGE ABOVE AVERAGE SUPERIOR

(29) General level of professional skills in respect to HUMAN OR INTERPERSONAL RELATIONSHIP.

N/A TOTALLY UNACCEPTABLE POOR AVERAGE ABOVE AVERAGE SUPERIOR

(30) Ability and willingness to adapt to given situations and to make the most of them.

N/A TOTALLY UNACCEPTABLE POOR AVERAGE ABOVE AVERAGE SUPERIOR

(31) Does the individual have patience in his everyday tasks as well as in his overall plan of action?

N/A TOTALLY UNACCEPTABLE POOR AVERAGE ABOVE AVERAGE SUPERIOR

(32) Willingnes and ability to recognize and to accept the fact that the needs, objectives and goals of the entire institution takes precedence over the needs, objectives and goals of the smaller components of the institution (departments, personal ambition, various activities within the institution).

N/A TOTALLY UNACCEPTABLE POOR AVERAGE ABOVE AVERAGE SUPERIOR

(33) Does the individual seek and allow input from colleagues and does he foster a democratic "give-and-take" relationship with his peers?

N/A TOTALLY UNACCEPTABLE POOR AVERAGE ABOVE AVERAGE SUPERIOR

(34) Does the individual seem to be of sterling character and personal and professional integrity?

N/A TOTALLY UNACCEPTABLE POOR AVERAGE ABOVE AVERAGE SUPERIOR

(35) Willingness to provide meaningful assistance to others.

N/A TOTALLY UNACCEPTABLE POOR AVERAGE ABOVE AVERAGE SUPERIOR

(36) Ability and willingness to work effectively and efficiently in small group situations.

N/A TOTALLY UNACCEPTABLE POOR AVERAGE ABOVE AVERAGE SUPERIOR

(37) Ability to operate without always thinking of "own little kingdom".

N/A TOTALLY UNACCEPTABLE POOR AVERAGE ABOVE AVERAGE SUPERIOR

(38) Ability to relate well with minority students.

N/A TOTALLY UNACCEPTABLE POOR AVERAGE ABOVE AVERAGE SUPERIOR

(39) General professional competency in conducting institutional business with others.

N/A TOTALLY UNACCEPTABLE POOR AVERAGE ABOVE AVERAGE SUPERIOR

(40) Does the individual possess competency and skill in developing procedures and policies?

N/A TOTALLY UNACCEPTABLE POOR AVERAGE ABOVE AVERAGE SUPERIOR

(41) General level of his professional skills in respect to CONCEPTUAL SKILLS (viewing entire picture in proper perspective instead of being concerned with only a narrow point of view.)

N/A TOTALLY UNACCEPTABLE POOR AVERAGE ABOVE AVERAGE SUPERIOR

(42) Ability to determine the needs of others.

N/A TOTALLY UNACCEPTABLE POOR AVERAGE ABOVE AVERAGE SUPERIOR

(43) Willingness and ability to seek out and solicit advice and counsel from others.

N/A TOTALLY UNACCEPTABLE POOR AVERAGE ABOVE AVERAGE SUPERIOR

(44) Sense of service above personal ambition.

N/A TOTALLY UNACCEPTABLE POOR AVERAGE ABOVE AVERAGE SUPERIOR

(45) Demonstrates "Professionalism" in his performance of daily tasks (punctuality, politeness, courteous, dependability, proper dress, loyalty, etc.).

N/A TOTALLY UNACCEPTABLE POOR AVERAGE ABOVE AVERAGE SUPERIOR

(46) Resourceful, imaginative and enthusiastic in his dealings with others.

N/A TOTALLY UNACCEPTABLE POOR AVERAGE ABOVE AVERAGE SUPERIOR

(47) General character of this individual.

N/A TOTALLY UNACCEPTABLE POOR AVERAGE ABOVE AVERAGE SUPERIOR

(48) Demonstrated concern with the professional growth of others.

N/A TOTALLY UNACCEPTABLE POOR AVERAGE ABOVE AVERAGE SUPERIOR

(49) Ability to create and maintain meaningful communication channels and utilize same adequately.

N/A TOTALLY UNACCEPTABLE POOR AVERAGE ABOVE AVERAGE SUPERIOR

(50) Willingness and desire to learn and to improve his competencies and areas of expertise.

N/A TOTALLY UNACCEPTABLE POOR AVERAGE ABOVE AVERAGE SUPERIOR

(51) Ability and willingness to work effectively and efficiently in large group situations.

N/A TOTALLY UNACCEPTABLE POOR AVERAGE ABOVE AVERAGE SUPERIOR

(52) Ability to provide and initiate innovative measures, procedures and processes.

N/A TOTALLY UNACCEPTABLE POOR AVERAGE ABOVE AVERAGE SUPERIOR

(53) Ability and willingness to accept criticism in the proper manner and to improve as a professional as a result.

N/A TOTALLY UNACCEPTABLE POOR AVERAGE ABOVE AVERAGE SUPERIOR

(54) General intellectual capacity in his professional field.

N/A TOTALLY UNACCEPTABLE POOR AVERAGE ABOVE AVERAGE SUPERIOR

(55) Ability to achieve empathy for others.

N/A TOTALLY UNACCEPTABLE POOR AVERAGE ABOVE AVERAGE SUPERIOR

(56) Ability to recognize, accept and understand the problems and beliefs of others.

N/A TOTALLY UNACCEPTABLE POOR AVERAGE ABOVE AVERAGE SUPERIOR

(57) Has the individual demonstrated ability and willingness to consistently work up to his potential?

N/A TOTALLY UNACCEPTABLE POOR AVERAGE ABOVE AVERAGE SUPERIOR

(58) Ability and willingness to think before acting in haste.

N/A TOTALLY UNACCEPTABLE POOR AVERAGE ABOVE AVERAGE SUPERIOR

(59) Has the individual demonstrated ability in skillfully utilizing communication channels?

N/A TOTALLY UNACCEPTABLE POOR AVERAGE ABOVE AVERAGE SUPERIOR

(60) Ability to allocate available resources for proper realization of priorities and/or goals.

N/A TOTALLY UNACCEPTABLE POOR AVERAGE ABOVE AVERAGE SUPERIOR

APPENDIX

SCORE SHEET FOR PSEC

ITEM	POINTS EARNED	ITEM	POINTS EARNED	ITEM	POINTS EARNED
1		21		41	
2		22		42	
3		23		43	
4		24		44	
5		25		45	
6		26		46	
7		27		47	
8		28		48	
9		29		49	
10		30		50	
11		31		51	
12		32		52	
13		33		53	
14		34		54	
15		35		55	
16		36		56	
17		37		57	
18		38		58	
19		39		59	
20		40		60	

24

25

SCORE SHEET FOR PSEC BY AREAS OF COMPETENCY

Area (A). Goal-Priority Orientation

Items:	Points Earned
1	_____
60	_____
40	_____
19	_____
32	_____
Total	_____

Area (B). Open-mindedness

Items:	Points Earned
2	_____
33	_____
20	_____
43	_____
11	_____
50	_____
53	_____
10	_____
Total	_____

Area (C). Willingness to Work

Items:	Points Earned
57	_____
23	_____
44	_____
5	_____
Total	_____

Area (D). Human Relation

Items:	Points Earned
6	_____
56	_____
55	_____
24	_____
37	_____
41	_____
35	_____
46	_____
14	_____
22	_____
38	_____
7	_____
15	_____
36	_____
51	_____
25	_____
29	_____
Total	_____

Area (E). Personal Characteristics

Items:	Points Earned
3	_____
34	_____
47	_____
12	_____
45	_____
4	_____
13	_____
Total	_____

SCORE SHEET FOR PSEC BY AREAS OF COMPETENCY - continued

Area (F). Professional Skills and Competency

Items:	Points Earned
8	_____
27	_____
16	_____
58	_____
18	_____
39	_____
28	_____
31	_____
9	_____
17	_____
42	_____
48	_____
26	_____
30	_____
52	_____
49	_____
59	_____
21	_____
54	_____
Total	

GRAND TOTAL _____

APPENDIX C

Full Time .....
Part Time .....%

Type or Print Firmly

OHIO NORTHERN UNIVERSITY

FACULTY RECORD

Quarter .....
Year .....

Name ..... College .....

Rank ..... Department .....

INSTRUCTIONAL SERVICE

Course Description			Credit Hours	Number of Students	Contact Hours Weekly*					Preparation Hours Weekly
Dept. and Course No.	Sec. No.	Title			Lec.	Lab.	Disc.	Act.	Ind.	
		Totals								

*by lecture, laboratory, discussion/recitation/ seminar, activity, individualized instruction.

CO-INSTRUCTIONAL SERVICE

Official adviser for ..... students.

List specific assignments or responsibilities which will assist in interpreting your work-load for this quarter.

.....

.....

.....

.....

.....

.....

.....

.....

.....

Average Number of Hours per week as applicable

Total of all Contact Hours as shown above .....

Total of Preparation Hours as shown above .....

Advising .....

Administration .....

Departmental Research .....

Other Services .....

Total estimate of average hours per week in instructional service and co-instructional service:

Initial after checking: Faculty Member..... Dept. Chairman.....

Acad. VP/IR - White; Dean - Canary; Dept. Chmn. - Pink; Faculty Member - Goldenrod

Detach the last copy of this form for your personal file. Give other copies to your department chairman.

DIRECTIONS

The Faculty Record is a University document intended for (1) an historical record of faculty assignments and activities and (2) a data base used to provide statistical information for both internal and external requirements.

INSTRUCTIONAL SERVICE

Credit Hours: For each class indicate the credit hour value received by students

Number of students: Number of officially registered students for whom the instructor is responsible. The column total of all students should be non-duplicate by courses; that is, no student counted more than once within the same course designation.

Contact Hours: The number of formally scheduled hours for class meetings per week. Assign hours by lecture, laboratory, discussion/recitation/seminar, activity (e.g., some classes in physical education, music, speech-theatre), and individualized instruction (e.g., supervised teaching, music lessons, independent study).

Preparation Hours: Preparation time for classes, informal class contact hours, grading and tutoring time assignable to listed classes. (Do not include formal class contact hours.) Estimate average hours weekly for this quarter.

CO-INSTRUCTIONAL HOURS (For full-time faculty and only as applicable)

Advising: Number of assigned academic advisees. Prorate for the quarter an estimate of average hours weekly for academic advisement.

Administration: Routine and special duties associated with college or department -- committee and staff meetings, correspondence and other paper-work, organizational responsibilities. Prorate for the quarter an estimate of average hours weekly.

Departmental Research: Schclarly work associated with professional writing and publication, research, development of courses and instructional methods, artistic and similar activities. Prorate for the quarter an estimate of average hours weekly.

Other Services: Other professional duties and services related to University service: coaching, University committees, student organizations, service with professional associations. Prorate for the quarter an estimate of average hours weekly.

The total of instructional and co-instructional service hours is intended to represent an estimate of an average "work-week" for the quarter within limited categories. Neither this total nor the Faculty Record as a whole should be construed to imply all the professional time, effort, and variety of services given by a faculty member.

APPENDIX D

OHIO NORTHERN UNIVERSITY
DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH AND PHYSICAL EDUCATION
STUDENT EVALUATION OF PHYSICAL EDUCATION ACTIVITY CLASSES

INSTRUCTOR _____ ACTIVITY _____ DATE _____

Quarter for which this evaluation is made: Fall Winter Spring Year: 19___-___

Evaluate your Instructor on a scale of 1-5 with the numbers meaning approximately:

5- strongly agree 4- agree 3- no opinion 2- disagree 1- strongly disagree

1.	The Instructor is fully qualified to teach the subject matter.	5 4 3 2 1
2.	The Instructor displayed an obvious interest in teaching and in his/her material.	5 4 3 2 1
3.	The Instructor was adept at analyzing students' skills.	5 4 3 2 1
4.	The Instructor communicated his/her ideas clearly.	5 4 3 2 1
5.	The Instructor gave the students a feeling that he/she was interested in the students' progress.	5 4 3 2 1
6.	The Instructor was not fair and considerate in his/her dealing with students.	5 4 3 2 1
7.	The Instructor avoided straying from the subject or wasting time in other ways.	5 4 3 2 1
8.	The Instructor began his/her class promptly.	5 4 3 2 1
9.	The Instructor encouraged students to think for him/her self.	5 4 3 2 1
10.	The Instructor encouraged participation in activity.	5 4 3 2 1
11.	The Instructor showed me how to use practice time more effectively.	5 4 3 2 1
12.	The Instructor was adept at improving students' technique.	5 4 3 2 1
13.	The Instructor was not willing to give students extra time or help.	5 4 3 2 1
14.	The Instructor motivated students to maximum effort.	5 4 3 2 1
15.	The Instructor made assignments and expectations clear.	5 4 3 2 1
16.	The Instructor expected the proper amount of work and progress from me.	5 4 3 2 1
17.	The Instructor wasted too much time in class.	5 4 3 2 1
18	The students had ample opportunities to practice and improve physical skills.	5 4 3 2 1

STUDENT BACKGROUND:

1. How many other courses have you had in this department? 1 2 3 4 5
   1 - none 2 - one-two 3 - three -four 4 - five-six 5 - 7 or more

2. Would you like taking another course with this instructor? Yes No

ADDITIONAL INFORMATION: Please take the time to respond!

1. Which aspect of this course did you like best?

2. Which aspect of this course did you like least?

3. Do you have suggestions as to how the instructor can improve the teaching of this course?

APPENDIX E

OHIO NORTHERN UNIVERSITY
DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH AND PHYSICAL EDUCATION
STUDENT EVALUATION OF COURSE INSTRUCTION

INSTRUCTOR_____ COURSE TITLE_____ DATE_____

Quarter for which this evaluation is made: Fall Winter Spring Year: 19___-___

Evaluate the course on a scale of 1-5 with the numbers meaning approximately:

5- strongly agree 4- agree 3- no opinion 2- disagree 1- strongly disagree

1.	The Instructor made the requirements and evaluation of this course clear from the beginning.	5 4 3 2 1
2.	The Instructor was well-prepared and secure with the subject matter under discussion.	5 4 3 2 1
3.	The examples and illustrations provided by the Instructor were in keeping with the material and helped me to understand the thrust of the subject.	5 4 3 2 1
4.	The Instructor was obviously not interested in teaching and in his/her material.	5 4 3 2 1
5.	The Instructor gave each topic an appropriate amount of time.	5 4 3 2 1
6.	The Instructor failed to present the material clearly, emphasizing the major points and their relationship.	5 4 3 2 1
7.	The assignments given were relevant to the goals of the course.	5 4 3 2 1
8.	I was stimulated to work beyond the requirements of the course.	5 4 3 2 1
9.	The Instructor was not intellectually stimulating (he/she did not cause me to think).	5 4 3 2 1
10.	An atomosphere conducive to the free exchange of questions and ideas was present in the class.	5 4 3 2 1
11.	The Instructor usually was aware of whether the class members were following the discussion or lecture with understanding.	5 4 3 2 1
12.	The Instructor was not fair or considerate in his/her dealing with students.	5 4 3 2 1
13.	The Instructor had sufficient evidence to evaluate my achievements in this course.	5 4 3 2 1
14.	The text was well-chosen and useful.	5 4 3 2 1
15.	The course was up-to-date, and the instructor was well informed of current trends and developments.	5 4 3 2 1
16.	I learned much which was applicable to my future profession.	5 4 3 2 1
17.	I enjoyed attending this class.	5 4 3 2 1

4/26/81

18.	I rarely missed class.	5 4 3 2 1
19.	The Instructor's speech (volume, tone, enunciation and rate) was an asset to his/her teaching effectiveness.	5 4 3 2 1
20.	The difficulty of the course and the work required was appropriate.	5 4 3 2 1

STUDENT BACKGROUND:

1.	Was this course required in your degree program?	Yes No
2.	Were your impressions gathered from other students about taking this course favorable?	Yes No
3.	How many other courses have you had in this department? 1) none 2) 1-2 3) 3-4 4) 5-6 5) 7 or more	1 2 3 4 5
4.	What is your overall GPA? 1) 1.9 or less 2) 2.0-2.5 3) 2.6-3.0 4) 3.1-3.5 5) 3.5-4.0	1 2 3 4 5
5.	Would you like to take another course with this instructor?	Yes No
6.	Expected grade in this course. 1) A 2) B 3) C 4) D 5) F	1 2 3 4 5

ADDITIONAL INFORMATION: Please take the time to respond.

1. Which aspects of this course did you like best?

2. Which aspects of this course did you like least?

3. Do you have any suggestions as to how the instructor can improve the teaching of this course?

APPENDIX F

FACULTY EVALUATION FORM

Professor _____

Course _____

Quarter _____ Year _____

(5) Excellent
(4) Above Average
(3) Average
(2) Below Average
(1) Poor

STUDENTS: Please complete the following evaluation form by circling the appropriate number after each question.

		5	4	3	2	1
1.	How would you rate this course in terms of its organization?	5	4	3	2	1
2.	How would you rate this course in terms of the clarity of the objectives?	5	4	3	2	1
3.	How would you rate the instructor's attitude toward and treatment of students (concern, interest, respect)?	5	4	3	2	1
4.	How would you rate the interest, enthusiasm, and stimulation the instructor brings to this course?	5	4	3	2	1
5.	How would you rate the instructor's willingness to assist students outside of classtime?	5	4	3	2	1
6.	How would you rate the testing and grading process in terms of fairness and impartiality?	5	4	3	2	1
7.	How would you rate the assignments and exams in terms of the objectives of the course?	5	4	3	2	1
8.	How would you rate the instructor in terms of being well-prepared and secure with the subject matter of this course?	5	4	3	2	1
9.	How would you rate the instructor's manner of presentation and ability to explain in a clear and understandable fashion?	5	4	3	2	1
10.	How would you rate the instructor's punctuality and reliability in meeting classes?	5	4	3	2	1
11.	In comparison to other instructors that you have had, how would you rate this instructor?	5	4	3	2	1
12.	What recommendations would you give other students of this instructor for this course?	5	4	3	2	1